REMARKS

Claims 50-53, 55-71, 89 and 90 are currently pending.

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action dated July 14, 2010 and the references applied therein. Applicants have amended claim 50. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 50-53, 55-71, 89 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US 7,307,958).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 50-53, 55-71, 89 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US 7,307,958).

Independent claim 50 of the present application has now been amended so as to recite "loading, at least temporarily, at least one program from the service server into at least one of the plurality of telecommunication terminals, the at least one program being configured to implement a speech processing algorithm for processing digitized speech signals in digitized form." Support for the amendment to claim 50 may be found, for example, in Figure 2 and paragraphs 52 and 55-56 of the specification as filed.

It is respectfully submitted that Lee does not describe the above-recited features of amended claim 50. In contrast, Lee merely describes the encoding of voice into digital data, known as vocoding. See Lee, Col. 1, ll. 50-55. A software vocoder may be downloaded from a called party's network to a called party's handset. See Lee, Col. 4, ll. 51-56. Lee thus does not disclose "a speech processing algorithm for processing digitized speech signals." A vocoder does not process digitized speech signals in digitized form. Rather a vocoder merely

respectively encodes and decodes voice signals into and from digital form. See Lee Col.1, line 50-55. Lee merely describes the encoding of voice into digital data, but does not disclose any further processing of the digital data. Thus Lee does not disclose processing digitized speech signals in digitized form, as required by claim 50.

Because Lee does not disclose the above-recited features of amended independent claim 50, it is respectfully submitted that Lee cannot anticipate claim 50 or any of its dependent claims 51-53, 55-71, 89 and 90.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 50-53, 55-71, 89 and 90 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 12-1216.

Respectfully submitted,

Erik R. Swanson, Reg. No. 40,833
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: October 7, 2010